REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

In response to the Examiner's request for information on page 2 of the Official Action, it is noted that, as of February 28, 2011, there have been no additional developments in the prosecution of the corresponding EPO application.

Claims 5, 13 and 14 are amended to address the issue raised on page 3 of the Official Action. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is therefore respectfully requested.

As a preface to commenting on the remaining issues raised in the Official Action, the following general overview is provided of features and operational characteristics associated with a method for adjusting several parallel connected heat exchangers according to at least one embodiment described and illustrated in the present application.

In an embodiment discussed in the paragraph starting on line 10 of page 4 of the application, for each heat exchanger of a group of parallel connected heat exchangers, a specific size of a heat demand for each heat exchanger is detected. As discussed in that paragraph, the specific size can represent either a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period, or a deviation of a desired value. Additionally, the specific sizes of all the heat exchangers are compared with each other, and the setting of the heat exchanger with the smallest specific size is changed such that its heat demand is increased.

Turning now to the art rejections, Claim 1, the only independent claim, is rejected based on the disclosure in U.S. Patent No. 6,390,381, hereinafter Laing.

Laing discloses a process for adjusting the heating loops in heating systems in which the temperature difference for each loop is compared to determine the loop with the largest temperature difference, and that loop's throttle valve is kept fully open. The Official Action evidently takes the position that Laing's loop with the largest temperature difference corresponds to a heat exchanger having a largest specific size of a heat demand.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the recited specific size represents either 1) a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period, or 2) a deviation of a desired value. Even assuming some basis exists for the assertion that a temperature difference can correspond to a heat demand, Applicants respectfully submit that it is quite clear that a temperature difference does not represent a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period, or a deviation of a desired value. Indeed, Laing makes no mention of a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period. Moreover, Laing makes no mention of a deviation of a desired value. Instead, Laing is focused on the relative temperature differences of the various loops.

Accordingly, even assuming some basis exists for the Examiner's interpretations as set forth in the most recent Official Action, it is quite clear that a method for adjusting several parallel connected heat exchangers, which are supplied

with a heat carrying medium, comprising the steps of detecting for each heat exchanger a specific size of the heat demand of the heat exchanger in a predetermined period, the specific size representing either 1) a ratio between opening times of a valve controlling the flow amount of a heat carrying medium through the heat exchanger and a predetermined period, or 2) a deviation of a desired value, comparing the specific sizes of all heat exchangers with each other, and changing the setting of the heat exchanger with the specific size displaying the smallest heat demand in a manner which increases the heat demand, as recited in Claim 1, is patentably distinguishable from the disclosure in Laing. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is therefore respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: April 12, 2011

By: /Peter T. deVore/
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. deVore
Registration No. 60361

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620